

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

PIN	5220	COUNTY	Orange
APPLICANT	Newport Beach, City of	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$397,500
PROJECT TITLE	Central Coastal Orange County ICWMP	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$530,000

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Provide for water quality improvements and habitat restoration across the ASBS region and assist the region's conformance with the goals of the California Ocean Plan.

**WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.**

**Score:** 12

**Comment:** The work plan is logical and concise with the appropriate deliverables identified. The work plan, budget, and work items are also consistent with respect to sequence of work. The budget seems reasonable, and includes a cost match, but is not supported or broken down into sufficient detail. The schedule is reasonable, and shows an accelerated performance period of December 2005 to adoption of the ICWMP in December 2006.

**DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** The region is well defined and the basis for the boundaries is presented. The proposal includes a map indicating participating agencies. The applicant has provided a thorough explanation of why all four proposed areas are included in region and how they share related water quality issues. ASBS areas are described in detail including impacts, social, cultural, and economic issues.

**OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8

**Comment:** The proposal includes definite planning objectives, but needs more clarification on how objectives are derived. The proposed plan could assist in implementing TMDLs.

**INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8

**Comment:** The proposal includes: habitat protection and improvement, water quality protection and improvement, storm water management, and flood management as water management strategies. The proposal could have scored higher if it demonstrated a better understanding of CCAs and provided further explanation of the relationship between the upper Newport Bay CCA and the ASBS.

**IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 6

**Comment:** The proposal lacks a schedule of implementation of the plan post adoption; however it states that implementation may occur as part of a larger IRWMP. The work plan indicates that the plan would recommend critical actions to implement a process for determination of necessary protection efforts (Task 4). The proposal states that a technical advisory committee (TAC) will oversee and comment on proposed studies as an integral part of developing the plan (task 2). Proposal could be improved by identifying and discussing specific management measures, and discussing how performance will be monitored.

**IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8

**Comment:** Although there is not a specific section that discusses impacts and benefits, they are thoroughly discussed throughout the document. The proposal would have received a higher score if the impacts and benefits discussion was better organized, made a stronger tie to local benefits, and explained how it would be adopted.

**DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** The proposal includes an analysis of existing and proposed studies that support proposed planning. It also includes useful ideas for additional documents such as the Public Use Impact Report, Laguna Beach Flow and Water Quality Assessment, Cross Contamination Study for impacts across the affected ASBS's, and the Pilot Renovation Experiment that will be completed as part of the proposal.

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

**DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** The plan discusses the development of appropriate plans and reports for the various studies to be performed and indicates that this information will be disseminated through their website and at the stakeholder meetings. The proposal could have scored higher if the process to manage and disseminate the data was clearer.

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** Stakeholder involvement is identified throughout the plan, including the development of a TAC. Task 6 develops a stakeholder/community component that supports community outreach, stakeholder training, and information distribution through a webpage (Task 6). There is a TAC, but it does not include opportunity for other stakeholders to be included in planning process. There is no mention of environmental justice concerns.

**DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 2**

**Comment:** The applicant discusses demographics of beach visitors and how all visitors and local residents regardless of socioeconomic status benefit from beach access. The proposal states that the region does not include any disadvantaged communities. The proposal does not specifically discuss the water quality or quantity needs of disadvantaged communities. Representatives of disadvantaged communities are not represented in the planning process.

**RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 3**

**Comment:** The proposal includes a review of local planning documents. While the application does include water management strategies, there is no specific discussion of how the regional water management strategies relate to the two levels of planning documents.

**AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 3**

**Comment:** The proposal provides for coordination and cooperation with local, State, and federal agencies. The proposal would have scored higher if coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers was discussed.

**TOTAL SCORE: 68**